arXiv:1406.6429v6 [math.OC] 23 Feb 2015

A note on polynomial solvability of the CDT problem

Daniel Bienstock, Columbia University, December 2013

Abstract

Recent research has focused on the complexity of extensions of the classical trust-region subproblem, which addresses the minimization of a quadratic function over a unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$, a problem of importance in many applications. Even though the trust-region subproblem can be considered well-solved (both from the perspective of theory and implementation) even minor extensions are NP-hard. The CDT (Celis-Dennis-Tapia) problem is an extension of the trust-region subproblem, involving the minimization of a quadratic function over the intersection of two ellipsoids in $\mathbb{R}^n$. In this paper we show how to adapt a construction of Barvinok so as to obtain a polynomial-time algorithm for quadratic programming with a fixed number of quadratic constraints (one of which is ellipsoidal) under the bit model of computing.

1 Introduction

The classical trust-region subproblem can be stated as $\min\{f(x) : \|x\| \leq 1, x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ where $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a quadratic function, i.e. a polynomial of degree at most two. This problem, which has received a great deal of attention in the literature because of a rich set of applications, can be efficiently solved – it is polynomial-time solvable and effective implementations are available. See [15] (and references therein), [26]. At the same time, seemingly minor extensions of the trust-region subproblem, such as the addition of an arbitrary family of linear constraints, give rise to NP-hard problems, and recent work has focused on understanding which extensions are polynomial-time solvable. See [10], [24], [8] for recent complexity results.

The CDT (Celis-Dennis-Tapia) problem [12] is of the form

$$(CDT) \quad \min\{f(x) : g_2(c) \leq 0,\ g_2(x) \leq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$$

where $f(x)$ is a quadratic and for $i = 1,2$ the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g_i(x) \leq 0\}$ defines an ellipsoid. Thus, the CDT problem can be viewed as an extension of the trust-region subproblem with an added ellipsoidal constraint. The CDT problem has long generated interest, see [10], where it was termed the "two trust-region" problem, [1], [7], [13], [14], [21], [27], [20], [21], [28]; also see [25] and [9], as well as their references. Broadly speaking these papers have sought to exploit the connection between CDT and convex optimization, in particular semidefinite programming; this approach is related to the use of the S-Lemma to solve the classical trust-region subproblem (see [22]). The inclusion of a second ellipsoidal constraint dramatically increases the complexity of the underlying geometry, even in low dimension, as demonstrated in particular in the elegant analysis in [25]. From our perspective, this analysis highlights an underlying combinatorial (or perhaps, enumerational) behavior of CDT problems as evinced by the local structure of solutions to systems of quadratic inequalities. Recently, an algorithm for quadratic programming with two quadratic constraints, which runs in polynomial time under appropriate assumptions, was presented in [23].

A separate line of work has produced results of a very different flavor in order to address related problems. Barvinok [2] ("Problem(1.1)") proved that for each each positive integer K there is a polynomial-time algorithm to decide if a system of the form

$$x^T M_i x = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq K, \tag{1a}$$
$$\|x\|^2 = 1, \tag{1b}$$

is feasible, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and M_i is an $n \times n$ matrix for $1 \leq i \leq K$. The construction in [2] relies on the model of computing over the reals (e.g., infinite-precision is assumed) however the extension to the standard bit model of computing should be straightforward [4].

Related and stronger results were presented by Grigoriev and Pasechnik in [17]. Moreover, it was argued in [18] that the results in [17] imply that a polynomial-time algorithm for a generalization of CDT exists. Also see [5]. Yet another line of research comes from the algebraic and computational geometry communities, in particular the theory of "roadmaps" of semi-algebraic sets, which was started in [11]. This topic appears related to the work cited above on "sampling" algebraic sets. See [6], and [16] for recent research results and additional citations. These research efforts have produced results with applications to diverse problem

domains. It is quite possible that other polynomial-time algorithms for generalizations of CDT can be derived from this work. A nontrivial point concerning such algorithms is whether they would attain polynomial-time complexity under the bit model of computation, as opposed to exact computation over the reals.

In this note we present a simple procedure that uses a weak version of Barvinok's construction to obtain a polynomial-time algorithm for a generalization of CDT under the standard bit model of computing. This algorithm will use a relaxed version of feasibility, as follows.

Definition 1.1 *Let $f_i(x) \leq 0$, $1 \leq i \leq m$ be a system of inequalities where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.*

(a) Given $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1$ a vector $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is called ε-feasible for the system if $f_i(\hat{x}) \leq \varepsilon$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. If such a vector exists we will say that the system is ε-feasible.

(b) An algorithm that, given any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ either proves that the system is infeasible, or proves that it is ε-feasible will be called a **weak feasibility algorithm**. *Note that we insist on $\varepsilon > 0$.*

The weak version of Barvinok's construction is as follows:

Assumption 1.2 *We will assume that for each integer K, there is a weak feasibility algorithm for systems of the type (1) with running time polynomial in the size of the data and in $\log \varepsilon^{-1}$.*

Barvinok's method [2] clearly fulfills this role, as does Grigoriev and Pasechnik's [17]. It is also possible that faster weak feasibility algorithms exist, as opposed to algorithms for exact feasibility as in (1). Also see [3].

To describe our main result suppose that for $0 \leq i \leq p$, $g_i(x)$ is a quadratic, over $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We consider the problem

$$\min \{ g_0(x) : g_i(x) \leq 0,\ 1 \leq i \leq p \}, \tag{2}$$

and prove:

Theorem 1.3 *For each fixed integer $p \geq 1$ there is an algorithm with the following properties. Given a problem of the form (2) where at least one of the $g_i(x)$ with $i \geq 1$ is strictly convex, and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, the algorithm either*

(1) proves that problem (2) is infeasible,

or

(2) computes an ε-feasible vector $\hat{x}$ such that there exists no feasible x with $g_0(x) < g(\hat{x}) - \varepsilon$.

Under Assumption 1.2 the algorithm runs in polynomial time. More precisely, the algorithm makes a sequence of calls to a weak feasibility algorithm for problems of type (1) with $K = O(p)$; the length of the sequence is polynomial in the number of bits in the data and $\log \varepsilon^{-1}$, as is the size of the coefficients of the matrices M_i, and as is all additional work carried out by the algorithm.

Thus, under Assumption 1.2, Theorem 1.3 implies that a polynomial-time algorithm for CDT exists. Theorem 1.3 is proved in several steps in Section 2. Throughout, we assume $n \geq 2$.

2 The construction

This section is organized as follows. In Section 2.1 we describe an algorithm to determine if a system of m quadratic inequalities is ε-feasible; this algorithm runs in polynomial time for each fixed m provided that at least one of the quadratics is strictly convex. In Section 2.2 the algorithm in Section 2.1 is used to compute the value of problem (2) within tolerance ε, in polynomial time, under the assumptions in Theorem 1.3. However, this does not yet yield a proof of Theorem 1.3 because the algorithm we describe in Section 2.1 relies on the weak feasibility algorithm in Assumption 1.2 as a subroutine. That algorithm (and in the strict sense, Barvinok's) decides if a system of the form (1) is ε-feasible but without producing an explicit ε-feasible vector. In Section 2.3 we show how to refine our algorithm from Section 2.1 so as to produce an ε-feasible vector in the case that infeasibility is not proved. This fact, together with the results in Section 2.2 will be used to complete the proof of Theorem 1.3.

2.1 Systems of quadratic inequalities

Here we consider a system of quadratic inequalities

$$f_i(x) \quad \leq \quad 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m. \tag{3}$$

We write

$$f_i(x) \quad \doteq \quad x^T A_i x + c_i^T x + d_i \tag{4}$$

where $A_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and symmetric, $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $d_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Such a system describes the feasibility set for a problem of the form (2); more generally we will use the solution of systems of the form (3) as steps in our algorithm for problem (2). Our main result for this section, proved below, is as follows:

Theorem 2.1 *Under Assumption 1.2, for each fixed m there is a polynomial-time weak feasibility algorithm for any system of type (3) where $A_i \succ 0$ for at least one index $i \geq 1$.*

We will first prove two technical results, Lemma 2.2 and 2.3, under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1. We assume, without loss of generality that

$$f_1(x) \quad = \quad \|x\|^2 - 1. \tag{5}$$

Then, for $2 \leq i \leq m$, there exists (polynomially computable) $U_i > 0$, such that

$$|f_i(x)| \leq U_i, \quad \text{for each } x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ with } \|x\|^2 \leq 2.$$

Now consider the following system of quadratic equations on real variables $v_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n, s_1, \ldots, s_m, w_2, \ldots, w_m$:

$$x^T A_i x + c_i^T v_0 x + d_i v_0^2 + s_i^2 \quad = \quad 0 \qquad 1 \leq i \leq m, \tag{6a}$$

$$\frac{s_i^2 + w_i^2}{U_i} - v_0^2 \quad = \quad 0 \qquad 2 \leq i \leq m, \tag{6b}$$

$$\|x\|^2 + s_1^2 + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \frac{s_i^2 + w_i^2}{U_i} + v_0^2 \quad = \quad m+1. \tag{6c}$$

Lemma 2.2 *Let $0 \leq \delta < 1$ and suppose that*

$$\hat{z} \;=\; (\hat{v}_0, \hat{x}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_n, \hat{s}_1, \ldots, \hat{s}_m, \hat{w}_2, \ldots, \hat{w}_m)^T$$

is a δ-feasible solution to (6a)-(6b). Then **(i)**

$$m\hat{v}_0^2 - m\delta \;\leq\; \|\hat{x}\|^2 + \hat{s}_1^2 + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \frac{\hat{s}_i^2 + \hat{w}_i^2}{U_i} \;\leq\; m\hat{v}_0^2 + m\delta. \tag{7}$$

(ii) *If $\hat{z}$ is also δ-feasible for (6c)*

$$1 - \delta \leq \hat{v}_0^2 \leq 1 + \delta.$$

Proof. (i) Note that δ-feasibility of $\hat{x}$ applied to (6a) for $i = 1$ states

$$-\delta \;\leq\; \|\hat{x}\|^2 - \hat{v}_0^2 + \hat{s}_1^2 \;\leq\; \delta,$$

and applied to (6b) it states

$$-\delta \;\leq\; \frac{\hat{s}_i^2 + \hat{w}_i^2}{U_i} - \hat{v}_0^2 \;\leq\; \delta, \quad 2 \leq i \leq m.$$

Adding these inequalities yields (7). (ii) Since $\hat{x}$ is δ-feasible for (6c)

$$m + 1 - \delta \;\leq\; \|\hat{x}\|^2 + \hat{s}_1^2 + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \frac{\hat{s}_i^2 + \hat{w}_i^2}{U_i} + \hat{v}_0^2 \;\leq\; m + 1 + \delta$$

which together with (7) implies the desired result. ■

Let M denote the largest absolute value of a coefficient in system (6).

Lemma 2.3 *Let $0 \le \varepsilon < 1/2$. (a) Suppose (3) is ε-feasible. Then (6) is $m\varepsilon$-feasible. (b) Conversely, if (6) is ε-feasible, then (3) is $(2n+1)M\varepsilon$-feasible.*

Proof. (a) Suppose first that $\tilde{x}$ is an ε-feasible solution to (3). Define:

$$\tilde{v}_0 \doteq 1, \tag{8}$$

$$\tilde{s}_i \doteq \sqrt{\max\{0, -f_i(\tilde{x})\}}, \quad 1 \le i \le m, \tag{9}$$

$$\tilde{w}_i \doteq \sqrt{U_i - \tilde{s}_i^2}, \quad 2 \le i \le m. \tag{10}$$

In (10), the value in the radical is nonnegative since $|\tilde{x}|^2 \le 1+\varepsilon < 2$. Now we claim that

$$\tilde{z} \doteq (\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n, \tilde{v}_0, \tilde{s}_1, \ldots, \tilde{s}_m, \tilde{w}_2, \ldots, \tilde{w}_m)^T$$

is an ε-feasible solution to (6). To see this, note that $\tilde{v}_0 = 1$ and (9) imply that $\tilde{z}$ is ε-feasible for (6a). Likewise, $\tilde{z}$ satisfies (6b) by (10) and $\tilde{v}_0 = 1$. Finally, Lemma 2.2, part (i) (with $\hat{x} = \tilde{x}$ and $\delta = \varepsilon$), together with $\tilde{v}_0 = 1$ implies that $\tilde{z}$ is $m\varepsilon$-feasible for (6c), as desired.

(b) For the converse, suppose

$$\hat{z} \doteq (\hat{x}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_n, \hat{v}_0, \hat{s}_1, \ldots, \hat{s}_m, \hat{w}_2, \ldots, \hat{w}_m)^T$$

is ε-feasible for (6). By Lemma 2.2 (ii),

$$1-\varepsilon \;\le\; \hat{v}_0^2 \le 1+\varepsilon. \tag{11}$$

This implies

$$1-\varepsilon \;\le\; |\hat{v}_0| \le 1+\varepsilon, \tag{12}$$

and together with is ε-feasibility of $\hat{x}$ for (6a) with $i=1$, it implies $\|\hat{x}\|^2 + \hat{s}_1^2 \;\le\; 1+2\varepsilon$ and therefore

$$|\hat{x}_j| \le 1+\varepsilon, \quad \text{for } 1 \le j \le n. \tag{13}$$

Then (11)-(13) imply that for each $1 \le j \le n$, $|v_0\hat{x}_j - \hat{x}_j| \le \varepsilon|\hat{x}_j| \le \varepsilon^2 + 2\varepsilon < 2$. Hence, using "sgn" indicate the sign function, ε-feasibility of $\hat{x}$ for (6a) imply that $\mathrm{sgn}(\hat{v}_0)(\hat{x}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_n)^T$ is $(2n+1)M\varepsilon$-feasible for (3). ■

Corollary 2.4 *A system (3) is feasible if and only if the corresponding system (6) is feasible.*

Proof. Use $\varepsilon = 0$ in Lemma 2.3. ■

Now we can present the proof of the main result in this section.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Consider the corresponding system (6), and let $\delta \doteq \frac{\varepsilon}{(2n+1)M}$. Using the method in Assumption 1.2, we terminate in polynomial time with a proof that system (6) is infeasible, in which case system (3) is infeasible (by Corollary 2.4), or, using part (b) of Lemma 2.3, with a proof that (3) is ε-feasible. ■

2.2 Estimating the value of problem (2)

In what follows we will use the following convention.

Definition 2.5 *Consider an optimization problem*

$$H^* \;\doteq\; \min\{f(x) : h_i(x) \le 0,\; 1 \le i \le k\}. \tag{14}$$

Given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ a rational V is called an ε-estimate for (14) if $V \le H^*$ and there exists some vector $\bar{x}$ with $h_i(x) \le \varepsilon$ for $1 \le i \le k$ and $f(\bar{x}) \le V + \varepsilon$. We will likewise define ε-estimates for maximization problems.

Let G^* be the value of problem (2), i.e. $G^* \doteq \min\{g_0(x) : g_i(x) \leq 0,\ 1 \leq i \leq p\}$. In this section we provide a polynomial-time procedure that produces one of two outcomes, given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$:

(i) It proves that (2) is infeasible.

(ii) It produces an ε-estimate for (2).

We stress that in case (ii) the vector $\bar{x}$ that yields the ε-estimate is not explicitly known. The algorithm, which amounts to a modified form of binary search, works as follows. As the initial step we run the weak feasibility problem on the system $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g_i(x) \leq 0,\ 1 \leq i \leq p\}$, and if infeasibility is determined, we stop with outcome (i). Otherwise we know some ε-feasible point exists. We next compute a rational $U > 1$ such that $|g_0(x)| \leq U$ for every ε-feasible x. Such a value U exists and is polynomial-time computable since we assume that at least one of the $g_i(x)$, for $i \geq 1$, is positive definite.

In a typical iteration of the modified binary search we solve the weak feasibility problem, with tolerance ε, for the system of the form

$$g_i(x) \leq 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq p, \tag{15a}$$
$$g_0(x) \leq V \tag{15b}$$

If (15) is infeasible, then clearly $V \leq G^*$ and otherwise there exists an ε-feasible $\bar{x}$ with $g_0(\bar{x}) \leq V + \varepsilon$. Clearly, after a number of iterations which is $O(\log U + \log \varepsilon^{-1})$ (i.e. is polynomial in the number of bits in the data) we will terminate with one of the two desired outcomes.

Remark. Assume (2) is feasible. For a given ε denote by $\bar{x}(\varepsilon)$ the $\bar{x}$ vector implicit in the final iteration of the modified search. Similarly denote by $V(\varepsilon)$ the final value of V. Since the feasible region for (2) is contained in a compact set, we have that as $\varepsilon \to 0^+$, the sequence of vectors $\bar{x}(\varepsilon)$ will have an accumulation point which must be an optimal solution for (2), and the corresponding accumulation point of the values $V(\varepsilon)$ is the optimal value for problem (2). If on the other hand (2) is infeasible then for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough the modified binary search will return infeasibility. An open question is whether exact (i.e., not weak) feasibility of (2) can be proved, using a weak feasibility oracle with a choice for ε where $\log \varepsilon^{-1}$ is polynomially bounded in the size of the coefficients in (2).

2.3 Computing explicit solutions in polynomial time

Here we will show that for each fixed m there is a polynomial-time algorithm that, given a system of the form

$$f_i(x) \leq 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq q, \tag{16a}$$
$$\|x\|^2 - 1 = 0, \tag{16b}$$

where the $f_i(x)$ are quadratic polynomials, and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, either proves the system is infeasible, or computes an explicit ε-feasible solution. Any system of the form (6) used in the algorithm in Section 2.1 can be reduced, by scaling, to an equivalent system (16) with $q = O(m)$ and n appropriately redefined. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ write

$$s(x) \doteq |\|x\|^2 - 1|.$$

Algorithm C, given next, sequentially computes values $\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \ldots, \hat{x}_n$, such that at termination either the system (16) is proved infeasible or the vector $\hat{x}$ is ε-feasible. In preparation for the algorithm we introduce some notation.

Definition 2.6 *Given $0 < \delta$ we let $0 < \mu(\delta) < \delta/4$ be any rational so that whenever $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are such that $\|x\| < 2$ and $\|x - y\| < \mu(\delta)$ then $|f_i(y) - f_i(x)| \leq \delta$ for $1 \leq i \leq q$, and $|s(x) - s(y)| \leq \delta/2$. Such a value $\mu(\delta)$ can be computed in polynomial time in the number of bits in the data and $\log \delta^{-1}$.*

Algorithm C

Setup. Set $\Delta = \frac{\mu^2(\varepsilon/2)}{n}$. Choose $0 < \rho < \min\{\mu(\Delta/2), \Delta/n\}$.

Initialization. Set $k = 1$.

Step 1. Let z denote the vector $(\hat{x}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_{k-1}, z_k, \ldots, z_n)^T$ where for $1 \le j \le k-1$ the $\hat{x}_j$ are values computed in prior iterations. Let

$$Z^k \doteq \{z : f_i(z) \le (k-1)\Delta \quad \text{for } 1 \le i \le q, \quad s(z) \le (k-1)\Delta\}.$$

For each index $h = k, k+1, \ldots, n$ use the algorithm in Section 2.2 to produce one of the following two outcomes (1a) and (1b):

(1a) Decide that $Z^k = \emptyset$. If so, set $k^* = k-1$, **stop**, and declare (16) infeasible.

(1b) Decide that Z^k is $\frac{\rho}{2}$-feasible and compute rationals $P_{k,h}$ and $M_{k,h}$ such that

$$P_{k,h} \text{ is a } \rho/2\text{-estimate for } \max\{z_h : z \in Z^k\}, \text{ and } M_{k,h} \text{ is a } \rho/2\text{-estimate for } \min\{z_h : z \in Z^k\}$$

Step 2. Let $\bar{h} \doteq \operatorname{argmax}\{\max\{P_{k,h}, -M_{k,h}\} : k \le h \le n\}$. By re-indexing, if necessary, assume $k = \bar{h}$. If $P_{k,k} \ge -M_{k,k}$ we obtain $\hat{x}_k$ by rounding $P_{k,k}$ to the nearest integer multiple of $\rho/2$. Else, we obtain $\hat{x}_k$ by rounding $M_{k,k}$ to the nearest integer multiple of $\rho/2$.

Step 3. If $k < n$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{k} \hat{x}_k^2 \le 1 - \Delta/2 + \rho^2$, set $k \leftarrow k+1$ and **go to Step 1**. **Otherwise**, define $k^* = k$ and set $\hat{x}_h = 0$ for $k+1 \le h \le n$. and **stop** the procedure.

We now analyze Algorithm C.

Lemma 2.7 *Algorithm C runs in polynomial time.*

Proof. First we note that Δ and ρ can be computed in polynomial time in the number of bits in the data, and in $\log \varepsilon^{-1}$. Thus at each iteration k the size of the description of Z^k is polynomially bounded in the number of bits in the data and $\log \varepsilon^{-1}$. ■

Lemma 2.8 *Let $k \le n$. Suppose that the algorithm does not stop at Step 1a of any iteration $k' \le k$, and that $Z^k \ne \emptyset$. There is a vector $\tilde{z}$, which is $\rho/2$-feasible for Z^k with $|\hat{x}_k - \tilde{z}_k| \le \rho$.*

Proof. Since at iteration k we obtain outcome 1b, there is a vector

$$\tilde{z} = (\hat{x}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_{k-1}, \tilde{z}_k, \ldots, \tilde{z}_n)^T,$$

which is $\rho/2$-feasible for Z^k, and such that

$$|\tilde{z}_k - \max\{P_{k,k}, -M_{k,k}\}| \le \rho/2.$$

The result follows from the rounding step used to obtain $\hat{x}_k$ in Step 2. ■

Lemma 2.9 *Suppose system (16) is feasible. Then for any $k \le k^*$, $Z^k \ne \emptyset$.*

Proof. By induction on k. For $k = 1$ the result follows since Z^1 is the set of points feasible for system (16). Moreover suppose $Z^k \ne \emptyset$ and $k < k^*$. Let $\tilde{z}$ be the vector produced by Lemma 2.8, and define

$$\tilde{w} = (\hat{x}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_{k-1}, \hat{x}_k, \tilde{z}_{k+1}, \ldots, \tilde{z}_n)^T.$$

By Lemma 2.8 $\tilde{z}$ is $\rho/2$-feasible for Z^k and $\|\tilde{w} - \tilde{z}\| \le \rho < \mu(\Delta/2)$. The definition of the μ function thus implies that $\tilde{w}$ is $(\rho + \Delta)/2$-feasible for Z^k. Since $\rho < \Delta$ this implies $\tilde{w} \in Z^{k+1}$. ■

Corollary 2.10 *If the algorithm ever stops at Step 1a, system (16) is infeasible.*

Remark 2.11 *A variation on the proof for Lemma 2.9 shows that if the algorithm does stop at Step 1a, then it does so with $k = 1$.*

Lemma 2.12 *Suppose the algorithm does not stop at Step 1a. Then at termination the vector $\hat{x}$ is ε-feasible for system (16).*

Proof. Let $\tilde{z}$ be the vector obtained by applying Lemma 2.8 at $k = k^*$. Thus

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} \tilde{z}_k^2 \;\le\; 1 + k^* \frac{\Delta}{2} \;<\; 1 + (n-1)\Delta, \quad \text{and} \tag{17a}$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k^*} |\hat{x}_k - \tilde{z}_k|^2 \;=\; |\hat{x}_{k^*} - \tilde{z}_{k^*}|^2 \le\; \rho^2. \tag{17b}$$

If $k^* < n$ then since $\sum_{k=1}^{k^*} \hat{x}_k^2 \ge 1 - \Delta/2 + \rho^2$, we have that (17b) and $\rho \le \mu(\Delta/2)$ imply

$$\sum_{k=1}^{k^*} \tilde{z}_k^2 \;\ge\; 1 - \Delta/2 - \Delta/2 + \rho^2 = 1 - \Delta + \rho^2, \tag{18}$$

and so, by (17a),

$$\sum_{k=k^*+1}^{n} |\hat{x}_k - \tilde{z}_k|^2 \;=\; \sum_{k=k^*+1}^{n} \tilde{z}_k^2 \;\le\; n\Delta - \rho^2.$$

Hence whether $k^* < n$, or not,

$$\|\hat{x} - \tilde{z}\|^2 \;\le\; n\Delta \;=\; \mu^2(\varepsilon/2) \tag{19}$$

(by definition of Δ). Now $\tilde{z}$ is ρ-feasible for V^{k^*}, and so $\tilde{z}$ is $n\Delta$-feasible for (16). Using $\Delta = \frac{\mu(\varepsilon/2)}{n} < \varepsilon/(2n)$ (Definition 2.6) this implies $\tilde{z}$ is $\varepsilon/2$-feasible for (16). This fact, together with (19) and the definition of the μ function now implies that $\hat{x}$ is ε-feasible for (16), as desired. ■

Corollary 2.10 and Lemma 2.12 complete the proof of Theorem 1.3. However we can prove an additional result, namely that at termination of the algorithms all entries $\hat{x}_k$ with $k \le k^*$ are nonzero, and "large."

Lemma 2.13 *Let $k \le k^*$. Then $|\hat{x}_k| \;\ge\; [\frac{\Delta}{4n}]^{1/2} - \rho/2 \;\ge\; \frac{1}{2}[\frac{\Delta}{4n}]^{1/2}$.*

Proof. Since the algorithm has not terminated by iteration $k-1$, we have $\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \hat{x}_j^2 \le 1 - \Delta/2 + \rho^2$. Since at iteration k the algorithm does not stop in Step 1a, there is a vector $\check{z}$ that is $\rho/2$-feasible for Z^k. Thus

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \hat{x}_j^2 + \sum_{j=k}^{n} \check{x}_j^2 \;\ge\; 1 - n\rho/2, \tag{20}$$

As a result, $\sum_{j=k}^{n} \check{x}_j^2$ is "large," i.e. $\sum_{j=k}^{n} \check{x}_j^2 \;>\; \Delta/2 - n\rho/2 - \rho^2 > \Delta/4$. This concludes the proof, since as per Step 2 of the algorithm $|\check{x}_k| \ge (\frac{\Delta}{4n})^{1/2}$. ■

Acknowledgment. This work was partly supported by ONR award N00014-13-1-0042, LANL award "Grid Science" and DTRA award HDTRA1-13-1-0021.

References

[1] W. AI AND S. ZHANG, Strong duality for the CDT subproblem: a necessary and sufficient condition, *SIAM J. Optim.* **19** (2008), 1735-1756.

[2] A.I. BARVINOK, Feasibility Testing for Systems of Real Quadratic Equations, *Disc. Comput. Geometry* **10** (1993), 1 – 13.

[3] A.I. BARVINOK, Estimating $L^{\inf}$ norms by L^{2k} norms for functions on orbits, *Found. Comput. Math.* **2** (2002), 393–412.

[4] A.I. BARVINOK, personal communication (2014).

[5] S. BASU, D. PASECHNIK AND M.-F. ROY, Bounding the Betti numbers and computing the Euler-Poincare characteristic of semi-algebraic sets defined by partly quadratic systems of polynomials, arXiv.org preprint math.AG/0708.3522 (shortened version in *J. European Math. Soc.* **12** (2010), 529 - 553).

[6] S. BASU, R. POLLACK AND M.-F. ROY, Algorithms in real algebraic geometry, volume 10 of *Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, second edition (2006).

[7] A. BECK AND Y. C. ELDAR, Strong duality in nonconvex quadratic optimization with two quadratic constraints, *SIAM J. Optim.* **17** (2006), 844-860.

[8] D. BIENSTOCK AND A. MICHALKA, Polynomial solvability of variants of the trust-region subproblem. *Proc. 2014 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA '14)*. http://www.optimization-online.org/DB_HTML/2013/07/3951.html.

[9] I.M. BOMZE AND M.L. OVERTON, Narrowing the difficulty gap for the Celis-Dennis-Tapia problem, *Math. Programming* (2014) 1–18.

[10] S. BURER AND K. ANSTREICHER, Second-order cone constraints for extended trust-region subproblems, *SIAM Journal on Optimization* **23** (2013) 432–451.

[11] J. CANNY, The complexity of robot motion planning. PhD thesis, MIT (1987).

[12] M. R. CELIS, J. E. DENNIS AND R. A. TAPIA, A trust region strategy for nonlinear equality constrained optimization. In P.T. Boggs, R.H. Byrd and R.B. Shnabel, editors, *Numerical Optimization*, 71-82, SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1985.

[13] X.-D. CHEN AND Y.-X. YUAN, On local solutions of the Celis-Dennis-Tapia subproblem, *SIAM J. Opt.* **10** (1999) 359–383.

[14] X.-D. CHEN AND Y.-X. YUAN, Strong duality for the CDT subproblem: a necessary and sufficient condition, *J. Comp. Math.* **19** (2009) 113-124.

[15] A. R. Conn, N. Gould and Ph. L. Toint, *Trust-Region Methods*, SIAM, Philadelphia (2000).

[16] M. SAFEY EL DIN AND É. SCHOST, A nearly optimal algorithm for deciding connectivity queries in smooth and bounded real algebraic sets. http://arxiv.org/abs/1307.7836.

[17] D. GRIGORIEV AND D.V. PASECHNIK, Polynomial-time computing over quadratic maps I. Sampling in real algebraic sets, *Computational Complexity* **14** (2005), 20–52.

[18] D. GRIGORIEV, D.V. PASECHNIK AND E. DE KLERK, Quadratic optimization subject to a fixed number of quadratic constraints is polynomial-time. Slides for a talk (2002).

[19] V. JEYAKUMAR AND G. LI, Trust-region problems with linear inequality constraints: exact SDP relaxation, global optimality and robust optimization, *Math. Program.* **147** (2014), 171–206.

[20] V. JEYAKUMAR, G.M LEE AND G. LI, Alternative theorems for quadratic inequality systems and global quadratic optimization, *SIAM J. Optim.* **20** (2009) 983-1001.

[21] J.-M. PENG AND Y.-X. YUAN, Optimality conditions for the minimization of a quadratic with two quadratic constraints, *SIAM J. Optim.* **7** (1997), 579-594.

[22] I. PÓLIK AND T. TERLAKY, A survey of the S-lemma, *SIAM Review* **49** (2007), 371 – 418.

[23] S. SAKAUE, Y. NAKATSUKASA, A. TAKEDA AND S. IWATA, A Polynomial-Time Algorithm for Nonconvex Quadratic Optimization with Two Quadratic Constraints, http://www.keisu.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp/research/techrep/data/2015/METR15-03.pdf.

[24] B. YANG AND S. BURER, The Trust Region Subproblem with Non-Intersecting Linear Constraints. To appear, *Math. Programming*. http://www.optimization-online.org/DB_HTML/2013/02/3789.html.

[25] B. YANG AND S. BURER, A Two-Variable Analysis of the Two-Trust-Region Problem. http://www.optimization-online.org/DB_HTML/2013/11/4126.html.

[26] Y. Ye, A new complexity result on minimization of a quadratic function with a sphere constraint, in C. Floudas and P. Pardalos (eds.), *Recent Advances in Global Optimization* (Princeton University Press, NJ, 1992).

[27] Y. YE AND S. ZHANG, New results on quadratic minimization, *SIAM J. Optim.* **14** (2003), 245 – 267.

[28] Y.-X. YUAN On a subproblem of trust region algorithms for constrained optimization, *Math. Programming* **47** (1990) 53-63.

Mon.Feb.23.083927.2015@littleboy
Tue.Nov.26.220720.2013